REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the Abstract is amended. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of at least the following remarks.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Washington at the interview held November 16, 2007 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The Office Action objects to the Abstract as including several informalities. The features objected to in the Office Action are believed obviated by the attached amended Abstract.

The Office Action also objects to the claims as being reprinted with lines that are too close together and a font size that is too small. Responsive to the Examiner's suggestion, a substitute listing of the original claims is attached hereto. The substitute listing of claims is double-spaced with 12 point font. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0072016 to Dalrymple et al. ("Dalrymple"); claims 5, 6, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalrymple; and claims 7-10 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalrymple in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,466,332 to Fukasawa ("Fukasawa"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dalrymple fails to disclose or suggest the features of the pending claims because it does not teach "selecting a black data generating table dependently on color of the extracted minimum value," and "generating a value for black using the selected black data generating

table," where the black data generating tables "have different black data conversion characteristics from one another," as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action rejects claim 1 asserting that a black data generating table is selected dependent on the extracted minimum value of the CMY data, referring to paragraphs [0065] and [0081] of Dalrymple. However, as discussed in the interview, Dalrymple does not disclose or suggest that the black data generating table that is selected depends on the color of the extracted minimum value. In this regard, paragraph [0065] cited in the Office Action states that the minimum input of the C, M and Y signals is taken and the output CMYK signals can be obtained by the equations in paragraph [0066]. As shown therein, the output for black (K_0) is equal to BG (K_i) where K_i is the minimum value of C, M or Y. In contrast to the features of claim 1, paragraph [0066] in Dalrymple indicates that the output black value is independent from the color of the minimum value. For example, K_0 will be the same regardless of the specific color of the minimum value component.

Additionally, in paragraphs [0081] and [0082] cited in the Office Action, Dalrymple indicates that multiple look-up tables (LUTs) can be consulted for determining CMYK printer signals. However, here also, Dalrymple does not suggest that specific LUTs are selected dependent on the <u>color</u> of the <u>extracted minimum value of</u> the input C, M, Y signal.

Significantly in the embodiment described in paragraph [0081] of Dalrymple it states "curves embodied in these LUTs have the same general shapes as those of Figs. 2(b) - (d)." As also discussed during the interview, it is abundantly clear from Figs. 2(b)-2(d) of Dalrymple that Dalrymple does not contemplate using black data generating tables with "different black data conversion characteristics from one another," as recited in independent claim 1. For example, while the output of C, M and Y may vary somewhat depending on which conversion table is used (i.e. 2(b), 2(c) or 2(d)), the output curve for black (labeled as line K in Figs. 2(b)-2(d)) is <u>identical</u> regardless of which conversion table is used. Accordingly, Dalrymple does not relate

to a method of generating color data where a black data generating table is selected depending on the color of an extracted minimum value, where the black data generating tables have different black data conversion characteristics, as recited in claim 1.

During the interview, the Examiner argued that Dalrymple discloses black data generating tables having different black data conversion characteristics because Figs. 2(a)-2(d) represent black data tables where the input is different because K_i is different. Based on this, the Examiner asserted that Dalrymple discloses a plurality of black data generating tables having different black data conversion characteristics from each other. Applicant respectfully submits that this is an unreasonable interpretation of the claim language which requires not only the presence of a plurality of tables, but also that the tables have "different black data conversion characteristics." As discussed above, each of the tables disclosed in Dalrymple teach to output the same amount of black based on the value of the input, i.e., the curvature of K is identical in all of the tables. Thus, the black data conversion value is the same regardless of the table that is selected in Figs. 2(a)-2(d).

The Examiner's proposed interpretation improperly ignores the claimed phrase "different black data conversion characteristics" which at least requires that a conversion value for black data differ among the plurality of tables. Applicant's interpretation of the claim language is supported by the context of the claim language itself, and in particular with reference to at least dependent claims 7 and 8 which further define the different black data conversion characteristics. The specification also supports the interpretation that that black data conversion is different among the tables, as described in page 17, lines 11-20, and page 19, line 10 through page 20, line 22. See also Figs. 5(a)-5(c) which illustrate that the conversion value for black data is different depending on which table is selected.

Independent claim 11 relates to a color data generating device that includes similar features to those referred to in connection with claim 1 above. Thus, for at least these reasons,

independent claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Dalrymple, whether applied alone or in combination with other references.

Claims 2-9 and 12-20 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 11, and are therefore also patentable over Dalrymple for at least the reasons enumerated above, as well as for the additional features they recite.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Aaron L. Webb
Registration No. 56,930

JAO:ALW/sqb

Attachments:
    Amended Abstract
    Substitute Listing of Original Claims

Date: November 20, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461